



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/840,677	04/23/2001	Randall Aaron Morton		4130
759	90 07/01/2002	,		
Randall Aaron Morton			EXAMINER	
29881 Weatherv Laguna Niquel,	wood CA 92677-1945		LANKFORD JR, LEON B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			DATE MAILED: 07/01/2002	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·			A 1! 4/a)				
Office Action Summers		Application N .	Applicant(s)				
		09/840,677	MORTON, RANDALL AARON				
	Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
	SI MAN INO DATE CHI	L Blaine Lankford	1651				
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the cover sheet with the corresp ndence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
′=	•	—· is action is non-final.					
, 	<i>,</i> —		occution as to the marits is				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
· <u> </u>	aim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.					
5)□ CI	aim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.							
7)[CI							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
• •	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. 							
Attachment(s)							
2) 🔲 Notice o	f References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	r (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/840,677

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention and as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite language. The structure or composition which goes to make up the invention must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Applicant's claims do not clearly define the invention. Pease note that the language of a claim must make it clear what subject matter the claim encompasses to adequately delineate its "metes and bounds". Applicant has not defined the parameters of the invention particularly in that claim 1 calls for the use of "the process of liquefication" but does not define that process.

Application/Control Number: 09/840,677

Art Unit: 1651

The courts have also indicated that before claimed subject matter can properly be compared to the prior art, it is essential to know what the claims do in fact cover.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

Applicant claims (apparently) that a homogenation of brain & kidney tissue can be used to cure heart disease, renal failure, strokes, Chron's disease, asthma, diabetes and paralysis. This is considered to be an incredible utility because there is no evidence or sound scientific reasoning to support this incredible utility. Applicant has not presenting any data at all showing any activity to correlate to this broad spectrum cure for the diverse diseases claimed.

Claims 1-8 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/840,677

Art Unit: 1651

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention nor does the specification enable one skilled in the art to make or use the claimed invention.

The specification also omits elements critical or essential to the practice of the invention, and thus the claims are not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Applicant does not clearly describe how to make or use the claims rejection, in that there is no defined procedure for making the used composition or any supported description of a demonstrated activity.

L Blaine Cahkford Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651

LBL June 29, 2002